

Title and Registration User's System for Tennessee - TRUST
RFP # 317.30.004 – Attachment 9.15
Amendments/Clarifications/Questions

May 9, 2001
Amendment 1

1. Contract Attachment N. Delete the attachment in its entirety and replace it with the following:

Attachment N: Implementation Schedule

Dates in this attachment are tentative & subject to change, at the State's discretion, any time throughout the project.

| <u>CRITICAL DATES</u> | <u>TARGETED IMPLEMENTATION MILESTONE</u> |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| August 8, 2001 | Project Contract Signing and Start |
| <u>TRUST DEVELOPMENT</u> | |
| October 8, 2002 | Complete the following TRUST Phases: |
| | Design Kick-off |
| | Design |
| | Construction |
| | Acceptance Test |
| <u>PHASE I IMPLEMENTATION</u> | |
| | Complete Phase I Implementation for the following: |
| November 8, 2002 | Dept of Safety: T&R staff, selected Central Office staff |
| | TRICOR: selected Inventory staff |
| | Five (5) County Clerk Offices & Satellites |
| | Intranet (for DOS, TRICOR and Clerk Offices*) |
| | Extranet (for Lienholders* and Dealers*) |
| | Internet (for the General Public) |
| December 9, 2002 | Complete State User Acceptance, Approval and Sign Off* |
| | TRUST 12 month Warranty Period begins |
| <u>PHASE II IMPLEMENTATION</u> | |
| | Complete Phase II Implementation at the following rate: |
| December 9, 2002 | County Clerk Offices & Satellites, counties 6 – 15 |
| January 9, 2003 | County Clerk Offices & Satellites, counties 16 – 25 |
| February 10, 2003 | County Clerk Offices & Satellites, counties 26 – 35 |
| Etc. (In 1 month increments) | Etc. (10 per month for counties 36 – 85) |
| August 11, 2003 | County Clerk Offices & Satellites, counties 86 – 95 |
| <u>PROJECT CLOSURE</u> | |
| December 8, 2003 | TRUST 12 month Warranty Period ends |
| January 9, 2004 | Complete Project Closure |

* Net services implemented in Phase I for acceptance/sign-off purposes. Actual users are granted access in Phase II

Title and Registration User's System for Tennessee - TRUST
RFP # 317.30.004 – Attachment 9.15
Amendments/Clarifications/Questions

Responses to Written Comments – May 9, 2001

| # | Question | Response |
|---|---|--|
| | Note: in the questions that follow, any vendor's restatement of the text of the TRUST Request for Proposals (RFP) is for reference purposes only and shall not be construed to change the original RFP wording. | |
| 1 | What is the location of the Preproposal conference? | See the TRUST RFP, Section 4.2.1. |
| 2 | What is the expected time length of the conference? | Pre-Proposal conferences usually last between one and two hours. However, they have been known to last the entire afternoon. |
| 3 | <p>Section 5.1.3 of the RFP states the following:</p> <p>"The Proposer shall set up and label a separate tabbed section for each table. Within these tabbed sections, the Proposer must structure its response in the same sequence, using the same labeling and numbering that appears in the table in question."</p> <p>We understand that to mean that each table should be a separate tabbed section within the proposal response. In addition, each row within the RFP table should be a unique section within that tab and should be numbered as defined in the table. For example, the tab for "Mandatory Proposer Qualifications" would include the following proposal sections:</p> <p>5.2.2.1 Written confirmation that the Proposer will comply with the RFP and Contract 5.2.2.2 Written certificaion of compliance with the items listed in RFP Attachment 9.1 5.2.2.3 Documenttaion of financial stability, to include the following: etc....</p> <p>We understand that the purpose is to facilitate the evaluation process, however, it will require many sections within the response with very little information (often only one sentence). Would it be sufficient to include the required information within each tabbed section, but not to create a section for each row? Instead, the Proposor would create the sections around a common subject and then provide a compliance matrix based on the tables in the RFP Section 9.3 which will identify the specific proposal response section where the informaiton can be found?</p> <p>Further, please confirm that the section numbers and the order defined in the RFP for the transmittal letter is not required.</p> | <p>The Proposal should include a tabbed section for each table listed in RFP Attachment 9.3, with the sole exception of the "Proposal Arrival Time and Packaging" table.</p> <p>However, there is no need to create a separate "section," in the sense of starting a new page, for each row within a table. Instead, within the tabbed section, there would simply be one or more pages containing separately numbered paragraphs, one after the other, matching the order and numbering of the table in question.</p> <p>Using your example, there would be a tabbed section labeled "Mandatory Proposer Qualifications." The pages within this section would contain responses to each numbered item (5.2.2.1, 5.2.2.2, etc.), labeled with these numbers. There could be more than one of these on a page.</p> <p>Some tabbed sections--for example "General System Requirements," "Reports and Inquiries," etc.--will only have one response within the section.</p> <p>The vendor's response must follow the sequence and numbering of RFP Attachment 9.3. Do <u>not</u> change the order of presentation and then attempt to clarify the location of responses through any sort of cross-reference, compliance-matrix, or any other device.</p> <p>The State does not confirm the vendor's understanding with regard to the Proposal Transmittal Letter Response. The numbering and order of RFP Attachment 9.3 should be followed. The Proposal Transmittal Letter should appear in its own tabbed section, and it should have paragraphs responding to each of the numbered paragraphs in the "Proposal Transmittal Letter" table. Each of these paragraphs should be numbered with the item number in question.</p> |

Title and Registration User's System for Tennessee - TRUST
RFP # 317.30.004 – Attachment 9.15
Amendments/Clarifications/Questions

Responses to Written Comments – May 9, 2001

| # | Question | Response |
|---|--|--|
| 4 | <p>Paragraph A.8.a. reads in part:</p> <p>"The Contractor shall be responsible for a twelve- (12) month Warranty period, beginning upon the State's written acceptance of the implementation of TRUST in all Phase I Implementation sites listed in Contract Attachment W: Implementation/Configuration Data." Attachment N (Implementation Schedule), however, shows that while all Phase I sites are installed and accepted by 12/9/2002, the warranty period does not start until 6/9/2003, a full six months later. Our questions are:</p> <p>1a. Is the warranty period twelve or eighteen months in duration?</p> <p>1b. Using Attachment N as the reference point, what are the beginning and end dates for the twelve-month Warranty Period?</p> | <p>1a. The Warranty Period is 12 months in duration.</p> <p>1b. There are problems with the dates in the version of Contract Attachment N that appeared in the RFP as originally published. The State has amended this attachment. See the attached Amendment 1, item 1 for the updated attachment and the dates for the Warranty Period. However, note that all dates in Contract Attachment N are tentative and subject to change at the State's discretion.</p> |
| 5 | <p>In regard to the following requirement from Attachment S:</p> <p>"The TRUST-POS system must provide alternative procedures (a back-up method) for certain TDOS activity, if the primary method fails. An off-line transaction system must capture and batch information that will be forwarded to the TRUST at a later time, at which time all work must be synced. The off-line POS system must produce valid renewals, etc. , similar to the on-line system but without contacting the TRUST database."</p> <p>Our question is:</p> <p>2. What "certain TDOS activity" is affected by this requirement?</p> | <p>The TRUST system should have sufficient capability to perform new registrations and renewal of registrations in the event the TRUST-POS is off line.</p> |
| 6 | <p>RFP Attachment 9.2 - Page 503 shows a ceiling payment schedule of Design Phase Kick-Off - 3%; Design - 10%; Construction - 40%; Acceptance Test - 65%; Implementation - 100%. The solicitation also contains a provision for 20% retainage, half of which is payable upon successful implementation at the five locations identified for phase 1.</p> <p>3. Would the State consider a ceiling payment schedule that more closely tracks the projects expected cost profile such as 5%, 25%, 55%, 15%?</p> | <p>As a correction of the vendor's question, the first half of the retainage is paid after the State's written acceptance of the Phase I TRUST implementation, <u>which includes three (3) central office sites and five (5) County Clerk sites.</u></p> <p>The State does not intend to change the ceiling payment schedule.</p> |

Title and Registration User's System for Tennessee - TRUST
RFP # 317.30.004 – Attachment 9.15
Amendments/Clarifications/Questions

Responses to Written Comments – May 9, 2001

| # | Question | Response |
|----|---|---|
| 7 | <p>In light of the Tennessee ITM there are vital planning items dictated by the ITM for TRUST that seem to be part of Tennessee's preparation for issuing the TRUST RFP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TRUST Scope and Feasibility Document - TRUST Requirements Baseline Document - TRUST General Design Document <p>5. Since these contain the critical assumptions and guidance, where are these available for use by proposers as inputs to well-informed bids?</p> | <p>To address each of the items separately:</p> <p>The State did not develop a Scope and Feasibility document, since the State was not using the ITM methodology at the beginning of the TRUST project. However, the State believes that the scope of the project is adequately defined in the TRUST RFP.</p> <p>The State did not develop a Requirements Baseline Document, for the same reason stated above. However, the State considers the pro forma contract and its attachments, as they appear in the TRUST RFP, to express the State's requirements for the TRUST system.</p> <p>The ITM does not require the General Design Document to be developed until the Design Phase. The Contractor will develop this document during the Design Phase.</p> |
| 8 | <p>6a. Regarding the State of Tennessee mainframe, what is the percent availability as to the system uptime?</p> <p>6b. Historically, what has the been the mainframes downtime, e.g. when it is not available for normal processing due to reasons other than regularly scheduled maintenance?</p> <p>6c. In the State's prescribed IT architecture, can the mainframe be viewed or function as a server or data warehouse?</p> | <p>a and b:</p> <p>The State Mainframe Computer rarely has any downtime except for routine maintenance. System Region downtime varies from application to application. Examples of Uptime: IMS1 99.70%; IMS2 99.07%; TSO 99.95%.</p> <p>c. The State Mainframe can be viewed as a server or a Data Warehouse.</p> |
| 9 | What are the disallowed non-standard software products cited on page 514, RFP Section 5.2.2.5? | See RFP paragraph 5.2.2.5. This paragraph contains a reference to Contract Attachment A: Project Approach, Section 4, which contains a list of categories/subcategories from which the State will not allow any deviation. |
| 10 | Does the per seat unit pricing for Imaging Software require unlimited use licenses for all seats? | The vendor should use the volume information provided in Contract Attachment W. The vendor should plan license needs based on these numbers. |
| 11 | How much counter top space (footprint) will be provided for the Counter Position Workstation? | Every site is different. The location and footprint size for workstations will be determined on a site-by-site basis at implementation time. |
| 12 | Is it required that the Counter Position Workstation support direct connection of a Low Volume Scanner? | The vendor should propose a solution that meets the State's requirements, given the volume information that appears in Contract Attachment W. |
| 13 | Will the Counter Position Workstation be placed on top of the counter work surface or integrated into it? | Every site is different. The location and footprint size for workstations will be determined on a site-by-site basis at implementation time. |

Title and Registration User's System for Tennessee - TRUST
RFP # 317.30.004 – Attachment 9.15
Amendments/Clarifications/Questions

Responses to Written Comments – May 9, 2001

| # | Question | Response |
|----|--|---|
| 14 | [Vendor Name] is considering a partnership with a firm called [Vendor Name] and would be interested to know if the State has had any experience with this company and what impressions, if any, there are of their performance. | The State recommends that the vendor obtain references directly from the company with which it would like to partner, and research these references as it sees fit. |
| 15 | Can the State share with us the names of any third party companies / consultants who may have assisted the State in preparing this RFP? | Contractors from the following companies assisted the State in preparing the RFP: Majestic Systems Integration Company SCB Computer Technology However, in this regard, please see RFP Section 3.19.3. |
| 16 | Pg 31 - The Counter Position workstations must include all hardware/software and meet all requirements specified in Contract Attachment S: Counter Position Hardware/Software Specifications. In addition, if the proposed solution includes a PC to perform Counter Position functions, the Counter Position workstation configuration must include Microsoft Office 2000 Small Business Edition software. The Contractor will perform the role of Systems Integrator to ensure that the Counter Position Hardware/Software installed as a part of TRUST fully meets the State's requirements as stated in the RFP. In addition Pg. 490 states that a Counter Position Workstation could be either a Point of Sale Register or a PC and a cash drawer. The above two paragraphs require that the Microsoft Office 2000 Small Business Edition software would have to be provided if a vendor were proposing PCs and a cash drawer. However, if a Point of Sale Register were to be supplied, the additional software would not be required. Is this interpretation accurate? How would bids be compared when the additional cost of the software is required on one solution but not the other? | As Stated in the RFP, "if the proposed solution includes a PC to perform Counter Position functions, the Counter Position workstation configuration must include Microsoft Office 2000 Small Business Edition software." On the other hand, Office 2000 software is <u>not</u> required if the solution proposed relies on a POS machine. As stated in the RFP, the vendor may choose to propose either PC's or POS machines. Therefore the vendor is in control of this cost component. The Cost Proposals will be evaluated as described in the RFP. |
| 17 | Pg. 33 Warranty - The RFP requires one year of warranty. Given the requirement that the county clerks must have very high availability of their system, it would seem to be important for the State to understand the differences between bidders' actual ability to meet the requirement of resolving deficiencies of a critical hardware failure in four (4) hours. Would the State consider adding evaluation criteria in the RFP to cover this area of performance? | These evaluation criteria are already present. See RFP Attachment 9.3, Project Management table, row "B-4, and all subsections." |

Title and Registration User's System for Tennessee - TRUST
RFP # 317.30.004 – Attachment 9.15
Amendments/Clarifications/Questions

Responses to Written Comments – May 9, 2001

| # | Question | Response |
|----|---|---|
| 18 | Pg. 33 Warranty - Would the State consider specifying that the four hour requirement be applicable only for any item that would shut down an entire office? The assumption would be that a failure of a single workstation in a multiple workstation environment would be resolved under the twenty-four hour category. | The requirement remains as stated in the RFP. |
| 19 | I would like to know what time of day and how long do you estimate the pre-proposal conference will be. | For time of day of the Pre-Proposal Conference, see RFP Section 2. Pre-Proposal conferences usually last between one and two hours. However, they have been known to last the entire afternoon. |
| 20 | Do you have an idea as to the estimated duration of this conference, this is probably an unfair question but I am trying to make flight arrangements out of Nashville. I was hoping that you have had some experience with these before had could perhaps give me an estimate. | Pre-Proposal conferences usually last between one and two hours. However, they have been known to last the entire afternoon. |
| 21 | I plan on submitting some questions in writing prior to the pre-proposal conference, will emailed questions be considered as "in writing" and what is your cutoff time for taking these questions? | See RFP section 3.3 for stipulations regarding communications. E-mailed questions will be considered "in writing." The deadline for the State to receive questions is stated in RFP Section 2, "Deadline for Written Comments." |
| 22 | Will the State provide all attendees of the pre-proposal conference a list of the attendees with phone numbers and/or emails? The purpose of my question is to try and identify who [Vendor Name] may want to partner. As networking the entire group would certainly be difficult. | A list containing the companies represented at the Pre-Proposal Conference and those that have submitted a Letter of Intent to Propose will be published shortly after the "Deadline for Letter of Intent to Propose." |
| 23 | Have you seen an application similar to this one installed elsewhere? 1a) If so, where? 1b) Who was the vendor? | Yes. a and b: The State recommends that the vendors perform their own research with regard to similar solutions. |
| 24 | Can you elaborate on the statement in Section 1 Page 2 that existing data must be cleansed? 2a) Do we know the status of this data and can you define cleansed? | Any computer system that is of the age of our current system is likely to have constraints on field sizes, name fields, multi-address limitations, etc. General design will dictate more details on conversion of data fields. |
| 25 | Microfilm conversion is stated as a part of the process. Are the costs of the conversion need to be included in this proposal or is it separate? | The State does not expect the vendor to perform backfile conversion for information currently on microfilm. |
| 26 | On page 54, you stated that code that was written prior to 1995 couldn't be utilized, what is the specific reason for that stipulation? | The State is interested in a solution that takes maximum advantage of recent advances in software and hardware technology. |